



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/699,311	10/30/2003	James C. Fye	H0005246 (002.2154)	3928
89955	7590	05/11/2010	EXAMINER	
HONEYWELL/IFL			SMITH, CHENEA	
Patent Services				
101 Columbia Road			ART UNIT	
P.O.Box 2245			PAPER NUMBER	
Morristown, NJ 07962-2245			2421	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	
			DELIVERY MODE	
			05/11/2010	
			ELECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentservices-us@honeywell.com
DL-ACS-SM-IP@Honeywell.com
docketing@ifllaw.com

<p align="center">Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief</p>	<p>Application No. 10/699,311</p>	<p>Applicant(s) FYE, JAMES C.</p>	
	<p>Examiner CHENEA P. SMITH</p>	<p>Art Unit 2421</p>	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 20 April 2010 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☐ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
Claim(s) allowed: _____.
Claim(s) objected to: _____.
Claim(s) rejected: _____.
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
Please see notes below.
12. ☐ Note the attached Information *Disclosure Statement*(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____.
13. ☐ Other: _____.

/John W. Miller/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2421

8. In response to Applicant's arguments on page 3, lines 1-11 that "However, Applicant respectfully submits that Reynolds" fails to describe the subject matter ascribed to it by the Examiner. For example, Reynolds fails to describe "a plurality of video decoders coupled to the plurality of video channels, each video decoder coupled to a different one of the plurality of video channels." To the contrary, Reynolds" expressly describes that a multiple video feed 206 is provided to a tuner 208, which selects a single channel. The decoder 208 extracts the different signals from the video channel (Para. 0041). As such, it is clear that in Reynolds" each decoder 220/224/228 is coupled to the same video channel. Therefore, each video decoder (220, 224, 228) is not coupled to a different one of the plurality of video channels incoming from the multi-channel feed 206. A component signal from a channel cannot be reasonable construed to be a channel in and of itself. Because Reynolds" fails to describe that each video decoder is coupled to a different one of the plurality of video channels, Reynolds" fails to cure the conceded deficiencies in Machida. Therefore, amended independent claim 1 is allowable over the combination of Machida and Reynolds" for at least this reason", the Examiner respectfully disagrees. As defined by IEEE, a channel is: (1) (A) (electric communication) A single path for transmitting electric signals, usually in distinction from other parallel paths. Note: The word "path" is to be interpreted in a broad sense to include separation by frequency division or time division. The term "channel" may signify either a one-way path, providing transmission in one direction only, or a two-way path, providing transmission in two directions. Therefore, the Examiner believes that Reynolds does reasonably disclose "a plurality of video decoders coupled to the plurality of video channels, each video decoder coupled to a different one of the plurality of video channels", as claimed.

9. In response to Applicant's arguments on page 5, line 21 - page 6, line 3 that "Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. To render a claim obvious, the cited references must disclose each and every element of the rejected claim (see MPEP § 2143). Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of Machida in view of Reynolds, Reitmeier, Miyazaki and Mizutome fails to describe at least inputting decoded frames into a video processing pipeline via a non-blocking switch. In her rejection, the Examiner concedes that Machida fails to describe inputting the first and second decoded frames into a first and second video processing pipeline via a non-blocking switch (OA page 13). In fact, Machida teaches away from the use of non-blocking switch (See, paragraph 0033 (image selection means 101 selects and outputs a prescribed number of images among the input images having high priority orders)). The necessity of passing along images in order of priority is antithetical to a non-blocking switch because each image cannot be processed/displayed concurrently without hindrance", the Examiner respectfully disagrees. Machida's system discloses that a priority order is given to the input images by the screen control means, and that the number of images to be output is determined by the screen control means 106. This number, may reasonably be all of the images input. As shown by Machida in Fig. 3, all of the output images are processed by an image processing means, without regard to order or dedication to a particular image processing means. Therefore, Machida reasonably teaches a non-blocking switch, i.e., image selection means 101.